

those home and abroad most hostile to this nation. A time when talk of American "swagger" and "bullying" comes tripping from the tongue.

For such times John Ashcroft was a target made to order. Devoutly religious, appointee of George Bush, he could scarcely have been a better fit for the bogeyman figure advanced as the greatest threat to our civil liberties—the perfect model to fire up the crowds at marches, and breast-beating festivals. Not for nothing do the Democratic presidential candidates out-do themselves denouncing the attorney general: they know, the candidates do, what has filtered down to their base, their main audience, after all. They all know, as John Kerry does, that he can say whatever he wants about John Ashcroft—that he views, as a nightmare, members of other races, creeds and religions; or anything else the Democratic candidate finds convenient—and it will all be understood, a mark of political virtue.

Mr. Ashcroft's detractors were at no time more infuriated—at least recently—than when he undertook his journey to various states, to speak up in defense of the USA Patriot Act. Indeed, Janet Reno, former attorney general, was sufficiently exercised by Mr. Ashcroft's journeys to come forward to join the denunciations of his policies. Ms. Reno, whose devotion to civil liberties was best exemplified in 1993, when she ordered tanks in to assault the Branch Davidian compound in Waco—which exercise resulted in the deaths of 19 children and 57 adults—has not been heard from for a while. But it is worth remembering that attorney general's notions of due process in a time of emergency. A dangerous situation was becoming more dangerous, Ms. Reno would later explain—there had been word that children had been sexually abused. In went the tanks and the flammable gas canisters. As far as one can tell, the ACLU launched no protests. The 19 children, were, it could be argued, certainly saved from molestation.

Mr. Ashcroft's efforts as attorney general have, as far as anyone knows, resulted in no such mass casualties. Still the hot-eyed demonstrators keep rolling out to shout their denunciations and wave placards saying "R.I.P. Civil Rights" and "Here Lies Your Freedom." Much has been invested in the demagoguery portraying John Ashcroft as the most serious threat to our liberties in memory: an investment that has enriched the ACLU's funding coffers, and delivered priceless publicity. No one should expect it to end any time soon.

MILLWRIGHT LOCAL 1043

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 23, 2003

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great admiration and respect that I offer congratulations to some of Northwest Indiana's most dedicated and talented workers. On Friday, September 26, 2003, the Millwright Local 1043 of Burns Harbor, Indiana will honor special members at their Annual Retirement and Awards Banquet at the Avalon Manor in Hobart, Indiana. Devoted to their hard work and dedication, these individuals will be recognized for their many years of service to their union. Members who have served for 20 years or more will be honored, as well as the 2003 retirees. Millwright Apprentice Graduates will also be recognized at this gala event. Finally, the ceremony will include special recognition of members who have passed away in 2003.

Local 1043, led by President Bruce Wright, will celebrate tenures ranging from 20 years to 55 years of service. Those members being honored for 55 years of service include: Nick Christoff, Joseph Drasich, and Steve Kicho. Millwrights who will be honored for 50 years of service include: Whitney Duhon, Robert Erickson, and Alfred N. Salvesen. Members of Local 1043 who will be honored for 45 years of service include: John Cisarik, Archie Fisher, Joe Williams, and Paul D. Maness. Those who will be honored for 40 years of service include: James L. Geer, John Pegg, and Herbert E. Sprinkle. Millwrights honored for 35 years of service include: Dona Banks and Carl Dean Robinson. Those who will be honored for 30 years of service include: Randy Ames, Jerome Bielak, Gary Talcott, Dionisio Trinidad, Louis A. Vendramin, John Vintila, David B. Whitaker, and John Zavalydriga. Local 1043 members who will be honored for 25 years of service include: Michael Adams, Greg Allen, Terrill Crase, Steven J. Kime, Mark Liston, Monie Parker, Jon R. Smith, Houston L. Stevens, and John Wardell. Finally, those Millwrights being honored for 20 years of service include: Jay Beere, Jay Childress, Jeffery Ludvigson, John E. Naccarato, Paul Pasley, and John Williams.

Local 1043 will also be recognizing and honoring dedicated members who are 2003 retirees. These members include: Jerry Forcht, Fred Miller, Rick Pierce, Gerald Purevich, Sr., and Kenneth Rippe. The Apprentice Graduates of Millwright Local 1043 will be acknowledged for their hard work and dedication. These individuals are Ryan M. Davis, Frank A. Hines, Thomas J. Hoeckelberg, Rodney L. Hyatt, Jon P. St. Myer, Gary E. Torbeson, Jr., Mark A. Tuszyński, and Vanessa Vlach. There will also be special recognition in memory of members who have passed away in 2003. These members include: Frank Kark, Lawrence Ray, Donald Janisch, William Kollada, James Dowdy, Thomas Stewart, and Tony Vrbancic.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues join me in congratulating these dedicated, hard-working, and honorable members of Millwrights Local 1043 in Burns Harbor, Indiana. They, along with all the other men and women of the Northwest Indian unions, represent the true backbone of our economic community. Their commitment and loyalty to the First Congressional District is worthy of the highest commendation and respect.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CLIFF STEARNS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 23, 2003

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I missed the following votes due to personal family reasons, Rollcall vote No. 506 (To H.R. 7, Charitable Giving Act of 2003)—Had I been present I would have voted "no." Rollcall vote No. 507 (To H.R. 7)—Had I been present I would have voted "no." Rollcall vote No. 508 (H.R. 7)—Had I been present I would have voted "yes," and given the following statement which I now include in my extension of remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support H.R. 7, and am glad to especially support the flat-

tening of the excise tax on the net investment income for private foundations from a two-tiered tax to a single tier of 1 percent. This could be one of the most effective steps Congress could take to spur charitable giving.

Currently, private foundations generally are subject to a 2 percent excise tax on their net investment income.

The tax was originally enacted in the Tax Reform Act of 1969 as a way to offset the cost of government audits of these organizations, in the wake of some unfortunate—and clearly wrong—mismanagement of foundation income. However, excise tax revenues have steadily climbed and IRS audits of private foundations have steadily dropped over the past decade. Specifically, in 1990, the excise tax raised \$204 million and the IRS conducted 1,200 audits of private foundations. In 1999, the last year for which figures are available, the excise tax raised \$499.6 million with the IRS conducting only 191 audits.

Congress reduced this tax in 1978 and 1984. In both instances it was noted that the adjustments were necessary because the revenues collected from the tax exceeded IRS auditing needs. Accordingly, the Joint Committee on Taxation recognized in its April 2001 recommendations the need to repeal this tax. Finally, the tax is inequitable, as other tax-exempt organizations are also audited, however, private foundations are the only tax-exempt organizations that have to fund their own policing.

Repeal of the excise tax would result in dollar for dollar increase in qualifying distributions of hundreds of millions of dollars every year, boosting the ability of charitable organizations to address national priorities across the range of fields that are the focus of some 58,000 private foundations. President Bush has proposed a reduction in this excise tax in his FY2004 budget to 1 percent, and for that I am quite appreciative. If we went further, though, the elimination of this tax would spur additional charitable giving. One of the most compelling arguments I've received comes from foundations pointing out that the money they would save from a repeal won't benefit the foundation officers, trustees, or even any employees. Who will benefit from a repeal of the excise tax? The causes for which each foundation was created. For example, the William Caspar Graustein Memorial Fund in Hamden, Connecticut writes me: "Congressman (Stearns), the William Caspar Graustein Memorial Fund would gain nothing from the flattening of this tax. The check we write to the United States Treasury we would instead write to our grantees. Our 2002 excise tax payment was \$22,176. We would prefer to put that money to work where we know it would help—the children and families in Connecticut." Signed, David M. Nee, Executive Director.

Foundations often spring from a corporate beginning. Take Robert W. Woodruff, the President of The Coca-Cola Company from 1923 until his death in 1985. He transformed the fledgling soft drink enterprise and its bottler franchise system into a corporate giant with the world's most widely known trademark. But this was not enough. Mr. Woodruff established a remarkable record as a businessman and philanthropist. Mr. Woodruff gave anonymously to many institutions, a number of which owe their very existence to his generosity. Prominent on Mr. Woodruff's desk was his personal creed: "There is no limit to what